

with goods. Money floods over it; investments heading south, profits heading north. Canadians and Americans pass through, with only a cursory glance from officials. For Mexicans—at least, for the now 58 percent of Mexicans who live in grinding poverty despite their country's "rapid economic growth"—it's a different story. The fence is there to keep them out.

Earlier this month, I travelled to northern Mexico with other Canadian church leaders to see what has happened to those the fence was built to retain.

In the once densely-forested mountains of the Tarahumara Sierra, we met with the indigenous community of San Alonso who gave us a letter for our government, signed with their thumbprints, that pleads for "an end to the impoverishment of our people". People here once lived from agriculture and from selling small amounts of timber. But changes to forestry controls under free trade have brought multinational companies and clear cutting. Soils for food crops are eroding. "Laws have been imposed that favour companies from other countries," says the local Catholic Church, referring to legislation that paved the way for NAFTA. "These laws have enabled much wealth to be taken from the Sierra, leaving behind growing poverty."

We saw the impact in the ulcerated, sightless corneas of a child whose mother had nothing to feed him but a soup of ground corn. We sat with an indigenous woman who had brought her dying baby to a dispensary run by nuns, and heard that 48 percent of infants in the Sierra die before the age of five because of chronic malnutrition. Other than suicide—a new phenomenon in indigenous communities, the nuns told us—many see only two alternatives: cultivate marijuana or poppies for drug traffickers or migrate north in search of work, abandoning ancestral land, breaking up families, and splintering communities.

In the farmland of Chihuahua, families who used to make a living growing corn and beans have also seen their livelihood destroyed by so-called free trade. Promised that NAFTA would greatly improve their lot, Mexican corn producers saw subsidies eliminated by 1997—12 years ahead of schedule—along with credit for small farmers. Meanwhile, the lifting of tariffs has allowed a flood of cheap corn and beans from the U.S., where farmers can access 5 percent loans and subsidies at 46 percent of the cost of production. Unable to compete, Mexican farming families are struggling to survive. Once again, we heard how people are reduced to eating little other than corn and we witnessed the agony of families torn asunder, communities dispersed, as former farmers are forced north to the squalor of the border or the perils of crossing illegally into the United States, in search of the means to sustain their children.

Our last stop was Juarez, on the border with Texas, a city rapidly expanding with newcomers from the Sierra, from abandoned farms, and other parts of Mexico that have only got poorer under NAFTA. Many have been lured by the promise of a job in one of some 400 maquila factories that assemble car parts or electronics for Fortune 500 companies selling to North American consumers. "The maquila has stolen our dreams of a better future", exhausted women barely out of their teens, told us, explaining the pressures of the assembly line, impossibly high production quotas, repetitive motion injuries and salaries of just US \$4.50 a day.

Others told us about employment conditions that beggar description: forced to work unprotected in the presence of dangerous chemicals, their right to organize unions thwarted by managers who bring in thugs

armed with automatic weapons. Earning in a day the equivalent of a two-litre jug of milk, workers are condemned to slums, without potable water or sanitation, where many live in hovels made of discarded pallets, covered with cardboard.

"Good fences make good neighbors." That's what the poet Robert Frost's neighbour told him one spring day when they were out surveying the winter-ravaged stone wall that ran between their properties. Frost wasn't so sure. He wrote, "Before I built a wall I'd ask to know what I was walling in or walling out, and to whom I was like to give offense."

The work that Messrs. Fox, Bush, Chretien and their colleagues do this weekend will be an offense if it does not address the unconscionable disparity between rich nations, like Canada and the United States, and poor nations, like Mexico. Policies such as those enshrined in NAFTA, which guarantee the free play of market forces, are an offense because they deny that which is the first democratic right—the right not to starve to death. Then they compound the offence by building barriers—steel, chain-linked, three metres high—to wall the hungry out.

The day the fence is no longer necessary will be the day to celebrate the arrival of democracy—true democracy—in the hemisphere.

#### TRIBUTE TO THE LATE JOHN H.P. "HAPPY JACK" CHANDLER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great citizen, State Senator, and a former Congressional candidate, Jack Chandler of Warner, New Hampshire.

On May 3, 2001, Jack's family and friends joined together to remember this remarkable man who touched the lives of everyone he met in the 89 years he was blessed to walk this Earth. He was unique and at times even controversial, but all that met Jack Chandler agreed he loved his State and he loved his country, a patriot to the end.

Jack grew up in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, and led a storybook life. He was a descendant of Nathan Hale, and his own convictions were rooted in the principles of our Nation's founders. In the tradition of Revolutionaries like Hamilton, he owned and operated his own newspaper, the Kearsarge Independent; and I am certain his editorials still blaze in the minds of many former readers.

Jack was a pioneer in New Hampshire's ski industry with the great idea to fill trains in Boston with skiers and welcome them to the slopes of the Granite State. A half century later, this tradition continues every winter weekend when the roads north are filled with skiers on the move.

As a politician, Jack Chandler was a genuine article. He stood firm in his beliefs and never hesitated to speak his mind. Perhaps he was one of the last in an age of politicians that never needed a poll to see where to stand on an issue. He constantly traveled his district, campaigning town-to-town and person-

to-person, always willing to lend an ear or a helping hand to a constituent. Although Jack did not believe in big government, he had a generous heart that even his critics grew to admire.

It is difficult to say good-bye to "Happy Jack," but I am grateful I had a chance to know him during his wonderful journey throughout New Hampshire. He made a huge difference in the lives of his constituents, his friends, but mostly his family. Godspeed, Jack Chandler.

#### CONCERN OVER ENERGY POLICY IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the very patient gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight because people all over this Nation are concerned because they see their utility bills going way up with gas prices possibly heading to \$3 a gallon, according to many articles. All of this is happening at a time that other prices are going up. Our economy has been slowing for almost a year now, the dot.coms have taken a dive, and many major corporations have laid off thousands of people.

□ 1930

These things are happening. Utility bills are going up; gas prices are going up because of years of environmental extremism and actions by the administration of former President Clinton all coming home to roost.

For years now, we have had groups of environmental extremists all over this country protesting and stopping or delaying for years anytime anyone tried to drill for any oil, dig for any coal, cut any trees, or produce any natural gas. This has helped extremely big business, which has financed many of these groups, because it has driven thousands of small and now even medium-sized businesses out of existence or forced them to merge. In the late 1970s, I am told we had 157 small-coal companies in east Tennessee. Now there are none. Federal mining regulators opened an office in Knoxville, and the regulators and the environmentalists drove all of the coal companies out of business. The same thing has happened to small logging companies all over this country. I have read and heard that many small communities have been devastated.

Today, in the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, we heard testimony about a proposal for 400 pages of new regulations by the EPA on the runoff from animal feeding operations. All of the witnesses told us that this would drive many more small farmers out of business and lead to much more concentration by the big giants in the agriculture industry. Those on the left are always telling us they are for the little guy; but when they create this big government that

comes down with all of these rules and regulations and red tape, it first drives out the small guys, and then it gets the medium-sized people, and it ends up destroying jobs and driving up prices. And who ends up getting hurt? The lower-income and the working people and the middle-income people of this country.

We are going to talk tonight, Mr. Speaker, about its effect on several different industries; and I am pleased to be joined here tonight by one of my best friends here in the House and one of the most respected Members of Congress, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS). I would like to yield to him at this time for any opening comments that he wishes to make.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is totally correct, Mr. Speaker. We have an energy crisis in this country today because for the most part it is self-imposed because of the extreme views of some people in this country about the environment.

Now, of course, no one is opposed to clean air, clean water, safe working conditions. We all want those things. But there has to be some common sense applied when we deal in these areas. We need some good scientific data; we need cost analyses, risk assessment, due process built into what we do concerning our environment and how it relates to our economy and to our energy.

As the gentleman just stated, this has cost our economy, it has cost the working people in this country thousands upon thousands of jobs. Since 1990, as a matter of fact, more than 100,000 jobs have been lost due to lower domestic oil and gas exploration and production. And then we can multiply that probably several times over when we look at all of the other industries, the timber industry, the coal industry. If we look at what has happened, we certainly, I think, have seen a self-imposed energy crisis; and it now is affecting our economy, costing more jobs. Every time someone pulls up to a gas pump today and they see \$2 per gallon gas and every time they get their electric bill and every time they get their gas bill or home heating oil bill, that has an effect on our economy and on the ability of my constituents and citizens across this land on the bottom line, how are they going to make ends meet.

I yield back to my friend.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. Let me just say this. What we are talking about here tonight is the hope that we can get some balance and moderation brought back into our environmental policies.

I voted for the toughest clean air law in the world, and I voted for the toughest clean water law in the world, and I voted to require double hulls on oil tankers and for higher grazing fees on our Federal lands and the Tongas Timber Reform Act, and so many environ-

mental laws I probably could not even count them all, and I am sure the gentleman from Kentucky has as well. But some of these groups keep having to raise the bar and are demanding more and more and more, or their contributions dry up. So I really think that all of this is about money.

One of the subcommittees on which I serve is the Subcommittee on Forests, and I was told by the staff of that subcommittee that in the mid-1980s, Congress passed a law saying that we would not cut more than 80 percent of the new growth in the national forests, and the environmentalists wanted that law. Today, we are cutting less than one-seventh of the new growth, less than 14 percent of the new growth, and that at a time when the amount of forest land in this country has been going way up. Yes, I said, way up.

I have been reading, and I am almost through with Bill Bryson's very fine book called "A Walk in the Woods," about hiking the Appalachian Trail. At one point in the book he mentions that New England in 1850 was only 30 percent forest and 70 percent open farmland. Today he writes, New England is 70 percent in forest land. In my own State of Tennessee, according to the Knoxville News Sentinel, in 1950 it was 36 percent forests. Now 50 percent of Tennessee is now made up of forests. Yet left-wing environmentalists have so successfully brainwashed many young people and children that I am sure if I went into any school and asked them if the number of trees had gone way up or way down in the last 50 or 100 or even 150 years, almost all of the children would say way down, when the truth is exactly the opposite.

The Subcommittee on Forests in early 1998 had a hearing in which we were told that 39 million acres of forest land in the western part of the country was in immediate danger of catastrophic forest fires, because when we cut less than 3 billion board feet, and to somebody who does not know anything about it, 3 billion board feet probably sounds like a lot, but as I said earlier, that is less than one-seventh of the new growth in our national forests, much less what is already there. But we are cutting less than half of the dead and dying trees.

So those dead trees which we cannot even get to to remove, once again, because of the extremism that we have had in some of these environmental policies, the fuel buildup on the floor of the forest has led to this great danger of forest fires, and we were warned about that in our subcommittee by our subcommittee in early 1998 and again in 2000. So then what happened? Last summer we saw 7 million acres out West burn, \$10 billion worth of damage. Yet, if the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS) or I went into one of our national forests and burned or cut down one tree, we would probably be arrested.

So what happens when we will not let anybody cut any trees? The price of

lumber goes up, houses cost more, furniture costs more, every product made of paper costs more; and once again, as I mentioned earlier, we devastate these logging communities. So what happens? We destroy jobs; we drive up prices. And who do we hurt? The poor and the lower-income and the middle-income people.

I remember a few years ago reading that the average member of the Sierra Club has an income of more than four times higher than the average American. Maybe some of these rich people in the Sierra Club are not hurt if gas prices go to \$3 a gallon or if the utility bills are doubled or if the prices go up on timber and everything else; but a lot of middle-income, millions of middle-income and lower-income people are hurt when all of those jobs are destroyed and the prices go up on everything.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield back to my friend for any comments he wishes to make at this time.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. As the gentleman from Tennessee just mentioned, why are we in this mess? What has caused this energy crisis? What has caused the problems dealing with our timberland?

Well, it is because there are those who have stood in the way of progress in this country and they have stood in the way of doing the right thing in defending some extreme point of view.

When we look at the energy crisis that we are facing today, the question is, How did we get into this mess? Well, number one, there have been no major oil refineries built in 30 years. There are 36 refineries that have been shut down since 1992. The refineries that we have now are operating at the highest level that they probably can, but current gasoline inventories are below the average level. What we have cannot create enough gasoline. It is a matter of the law of supply and demand. There is not enough supply for the demand in this country today.

In 1992, our U.S. oil production, or since 1992, our U.S. oil production is down 17 percent, but our consumption is up 14 percent. And nearly 60 percent of our oil is imported.

So here we are. We are dependent on foreign oil. We cannot get enough oil, and if we were able to get enough oil at this point, we do not have the refinery capacity to produce the gasoline. So it does not take too much reasoning to figure out the problem we are in here. We just do not have enough supply for the demand, and it is hurting our Nation. It is causing some real problems. As the gentleman just said, it is hurting the people that our workers, our middle class, our poor, because they depend on the ability for low-priced fuel. We are going to see more problems.

What is the answer? I guess that is the question, What is the answer? Well, we have a great supply of oil in Alaska. We have great supplies of oil off of our shores; and with the technology that

we have today, we have the technology to go in and get those oil reserves without hurting the environment.

Mr. Speaker, this is the problem. We have come a long way since the 1970s in producing technology that protects the environment, but allows us to have the energy resources we need to keep our economy moving in the right direction. But there are those that are extreme, the extreme environmentalists. They do not want to use the technologies. They do not want to do anything. They want to make sure that not one renewable resource like a tree is touched; they do not want to go in the direction of common sense. They want to stake out these extreme positions and stand there.

The sad part about it, there are many here in Washington that want to support that extreme point of view, and they do not want to do what we have to do, and that is go after the resources we have and use those resources, the oil, the coal, and the natural gas. I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I think the gentleman is exactly right. When we cut fewer and fewer trees, we destroy jobs and we drive up prices, as I said, for homes and furniture and every type of paper product. When we restrict and cut back and eliminate coal companies and coal production, we drive up utility bills and drive up costs for businesses that have to be passed on to the consumer for every type of product, and we destroy more jobs.

When we close half of the oil refineries, as we have done since 1980, and we sign, as President Clinton did, orders to not allow oil drilling in Alaska, and 80 percent of our offshore capabilities, we drive up the price for oil and gas and destroy more jobs. When we sign, as President Clinton did just before he left office, an order locking up 213 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, we drive up utility bills and destroy prices. For anyone who wants more information on this lockup of natural gas, they can read last month's Consumers' Research Magazine and the article by Rider from USA Today in which he said that President Clinton locked up 213 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. Mr. Speaker, then what happens? People's utility bills all over the country go way up.

I have the mayor of Engelwood, Tennessee, a small town in my district, who comes to me and tells me that he has senior citizens who are having to choose between eating or paying their utility bills. Once again, I say who we hurt with this environmental extremism is not these wealthy environmentalists; but we hurt the poor and the lower-income and the working people because we destroy jobs and drive up prices, and it hurts those lower-income people, and now even middle-income people who are becoming very concerned about how these bills are going up.

□ 1945

But the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS) mentioned the oil situation.

Last September 25, long before the current administration came in, the Washington Post National Weekly Edition had a cover story headline which said, "Will rising oil prices kill the boom?"

I can tell the Members that Aviation Daily reported last December that 12 airlines went into bankruptcy last year, mainly due to higher-than-expected oil prices. The Air Transport Association told me, and I chaired for the last 6 years the Subcommittee on Aviation so this was of special interest to me, they told me that each one penny interest in jet fuel cost the industry as a whole \$200 million. So if oil prices go up, airline tickets have to go up. Then more people are forced onto our much less safe highways, the trucking industry is hurt, agriculture is hurt, and almost everything is hurt. Then, as the Washington Post asked on its cover, "Will rising oil prices kill the boom?"

As the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS) said, and I think he has some additional information, we have all of this oil. We have so much oil. I heard one radio report saying oil is the second most plentiful liquid today, after salt water, and we have hundreds of years of supplies if we did not have these extreme groups keeping us from getting to it.

Vice President CHENEY gave us a briefing this morning. He said that today well over half of our oil is having to be imported, and that by the year 2020, it is going to be two-thirds of our oil, and we are going to be even more subject to being held hostage by OPEC and some of these other foreign countries.

Now, the U.S. Geologic Survey tells us that we have I think it is 16 billion barrels of oil in one little tiny place, on the coastal plain of Alaska. I can tell the Members, I have been up there twice. I have been twice to Prudhoe Bay.

The first time was about 6 years ago, and I had a man in the Anchorage Airport who I told where I was going, and he said, well, if you see anything up there taller than 2 feet, it was put there yesterday by a man.

Some of these groups show this false, almost Nazi-like propaganda showing trees and mountains and so forth. The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is 19.8 million acres. It is so big we almost cannot comprehend it. It is 35 times the size of the Great Smokies, a big part of which are in my district.

We have between 9 million and 10 million visitors a year to the Great Smokies. Time Magazine reported a couple of months ago that last year the entire Arctic National Wildlife Refuge had 1,000 visitors, because there are no roads or paths, and it is dangerous for most people to go up there.

We could drill on about 2,000 acres out of that 19.8 million acres and po-

tentially get up to 16 billion barrels of oil, which is equal to 30 years of Saudi oil. We could do it in an environmentally safe way. Yet, we cannot do it. The votes are not there because of environmental extremists who put out all this false propaganda, so people see their gas prices going up and potentially going up much higher.

I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS) because he has more information about the ANWR.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, the information that is put out by some of these extreme groups says that this is pristine forest and a beautiful landscape, and it is the last great frontier.

I have a picture of the area that would be drilled. Like the gentleman said, it is 2,000 acres. It would be about the size of Dulles Airport where the drilling would take place. With the technology that we have today, there would be no harm done to the environment. Here is a picture of that pristine, beautiful landscape. It looks like the moon. There is nothing there. It is amazing.

If we look at some of these other areas, yes, they are beautiful landscapes, but this is the coastal plain, ANWR, where the drilling would be done. I think there has been some false information put out about what that area looks like and the damage that would be done to wildlife.

The efforts that would be put in place there to get that 30-year supply of oil would certainly, with the technology we have today, would certainly do no harm to that environment.

What would this mean to American workers if we go after that oil, if we start to work on our own domestic supplies for energy? I was reading in the Washington Times yesterday that the energy plan that the President is talking about would call for building between 1,300 and 1,900 new power plants and spending \$150 billion on new pipelines and transmission facilities, creating millions of jobs for carpenters plus energy, electrical, and construction and operation and maintenance workers all over this land. It would create a lot of jobs to get us back, really, to where we need to go for our energy supply in this country.

But if we do not, if we do not go after what we have that God has blessed this Nation with, then there are going to be a lot more jobs lost because of this extreme view. And I think, yes, here in Congress we should, in a bipartisan way, come together and work for the good of the American people and not let this be a political football.

But there are already those, our friends across the aisle, that are saying the way out of this mess would be to conserve our energy. Well, we would have a tough time conserving our way out of our energy crisis at this point, especially when we are about 1,900 utility power plants behind, we are depending on 60 percent of our oil from foreign sources, and we still do not have

enough. We do not have enough refineries.

Yes, we can do some more conservation, but the bottom line is, we have to go after the supply to meet the demand for this country and meet the needs of our economy for the 21st century.

Mr. DUNCAN. I thank the gentleman, once again, he is exactly right on target.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, we are simply trying to say that we hope to bring back some moderation and balance to our environmental policies, instead of allowing environmental extremists to control all of these things.

It is like I have seen cartoons showing hundreds of oil wells in that Arctic wildlife refuge. That is totally false, because today the technology is such, as the gentleman mentioned, that we could put one oil well and go out 4 and 5 miles in any direction, so the footprint on the land is hardly anything at all.

They said the people who opposed the original Alaska pipeline, and thank goodness we have that or we would have been in trouble years ago, they said it would kill off the caribou. At that time they say there were between 5,000 and 6,000 caribou. Now there are over 30,000 caribou. So all of this can be done in an environmentally safe way.

As I said earlier, the coastal plain, which is 1.5 million acres, and as I said, I have been there twice, and most of these people who are against this have never even been there, there is not a tree or bush up there. It is a frozen tundra, as they call it. As the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS) said, it looks like a moonscape.

I was up there in August. Both times I was there in August it was brown with little puddles of oil seeping up. Most of the year it is covered by snow and ice. Yet, these groups show these pictures of the mountains and trees where nobody has ever advocated drilling for oil.

As I said earlier, I have noticed over the years that most of these extreme environmentalists seem to come from wealthy or very upper-income families. As I said before, maybe they are not hurt if utility bills double or gas prices go way up, but millions of people are hurt and millions more are going to be hurt even worse if we do not start getting some order, moderation, and balance back into our environmental policies.

The Sierra Club and some of these other environmental groups have gone so far to the left now they make even socialists look conservative. Some of these radical environmentalists, some proudly call themselves ecoterrorists, seem to want to shut this country down economically.

They seem not to realize that the worst pollution in the world has occurred in the Communist and socialist nations because their economies do not generate enough income to do the good things for the environment that all of us want to do, so they protest any time

anyone wants to dig for any coal or drill for any oil or cut any trees or produce any natural gas.

Then these coal companies and timber companies and oil refineries and small natural gas producers that are run out of business can no longer hire accountants and salespeople and lawyers and blue collar workers, and people wonder why their college graduate children or grandchildren cannot find jobs, cannot find good jobs and have to work in restaurants, as many college students are working today, and why they have to go to graduate school.

Mr. Speaker, this is really all about money. Environmental groups have to continually tell us how bad everything is or their contributions will dry up. Many of their contributions, as I have said, come from extremely big businesses, which are really the only ones which benefit when all of these small- and medium-sized businesses are forced out of business or forced to merge.

Also, they are big enough to get the huge Federal contracts with obscene markups to do the environmental cleanup that is demanded by the same groups that they fund.

It is amazing, I think, when these liberals and left-wingers and environmental extremists claim to be the friend of the little guy, because they are the best friends that extremely big business has. But almost everything they do ends up hurting the poor and lower-income people, and very small businesses and small farms. Jobs are destroyed and prices go up. More and more jobs are forced to go to other countries.

Some groups, of course, receive contributions from foreign oil companies and people connected to OPEC or foreign shipping companies. There are many large foreign companies, and even some large U.S. companies that benefit greatly and make huge money if we have to import more oil, or more of other products, for that matter. It is all about money.

That is what the Kyoto agreement is all about, for instance, because the U.S. relied on a free enterprise-free market economy with small government until recent years. The U.S. now purchases 25 percent of the world's goods, though we have just slightly over 4 percent of the world's population. Many countries are jealous of this, and believe they could take more of our jobs and income if we had to reduce our energy use by 30 percent, as the Kyoto agreement would require.

The Kyoto agreement excludes such large polluters as Mexico and China and more than 125 other countries. This treaty would devastate our economy, and we should all praise President Bush for not caving in to the demands of extremists and going along with such a potentially harmful agreement.

Some people who support the Kyoto agreement and oppose any type of coal or oil or lumber or natural gas production in this country know that their policies would be very harmful to the

U.S. economically, and yet they do these things anyway.

I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS) for any comments he wishes to make.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Speaking of the Kyoto treaty, I was in China a few years ago. I was in Sian, China. The smog, coal, smoke in that city was so bad that the people, the citizens of that city, had to wear like surgical masks. We could not see for the pollution. In the Kyoto treaty, it is my understanding that they were exempt from the environmental restraints that we would have been placing ourselves under. That did not make a lot of sense to me.

We have done a good job in this country with technology, we have done some good things with our environment, and new technology and reasonable regulations can make increased consumption of our energy supplies possible and continue to decrease pollution. But there has to be, again, some common sense built into it.

In Kentucky, I can use Kentucky as a good example, through clean coal technology, we use a lot of coal in our utilities, and we have the lowest or I think probably the second- or third-lowest rates for our electric utility bills of any State in the Nation. But through coal technology, we have really reduced emissions, and in fact, it is almost as clean now as the natural gas being used in other utility companies.

So with clean coal technologies, we have been able to increase coal by 195 percent over the last 30 years, while cutting coal air emissions by one-third. So we have a 300-year supply of coal, and we have done the right things in being able to use that energy source, but no one wants to reward that. They want to take it even to a greater extreme and say, basically, no coal, no oil; we are going to have to move on to some alternative energy sources that will not meet the demand that we have today.

Again, it comes back to getting rid of the extremism and getting into a scientific-based commonsense approach to how we are going to deal with our energy supply in this country.

□ 2000

We are blessed and we need to use those blessings to benefit our population here in this country. I think it is certainly time that we start looking at the handwriting on the wall and today start turning the situation around.

I think you can compare the situation in Kentucky and California. We have new power plants coming online. We have the energy. We have low-cost energy, so we could do that across this country, but we have to start.

Mr. Speaker, 1,300 or 1,900 new power plants over the next 20 years to just get us to the supply we are going to need in order to provide the electricity for this country, if anything, stands in our way and that does not make sense. We are hurting our economy, and we are

hurting the working people in this country.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and he is exactly right. I mentioned the briefing that Vice President CHENEY gave us this morning. We were not given all the details, but President Bush, among other things, I am told, is going to announce in his energy plan tomorrow \$2 billion for clean coal technology.

The President is not going to announce any tax breaks for big oil companies or big gas companies, but he is going to advocate tax breaks or incentives for alternative energy sources and for renewable energy sources. Yet he still will be attacked on it, I am sure.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS) mentioned the Kyoto agreement. The global climate information project said that, quote, So while the U.S. cuts energy use by more than 30 percent, most U.N. countries get a free ride. Because U.S. energy prices will rise, American products could be more expensive at home and less competitive overseas. That will slow down our economic growth and cost American jobs, all for a treaty that will produce little or no environmental benefit.

One thing it would do for sure is speed up the transfer of wealth and jobs from this Nation to underdeveloped countries.

I can tell you unless you can reduce your standard of living by 30 percent overnight, which very few people in this country would want to do, and no one should want to do, no one should have to do because we do not have to, if we can just get a little moderation and balance back into our environmental policies instead of following the extremist groups that have power far beyond their numbers.

As I mentioned earlier, some of these people I think know that this Kyoto agreement would devastate our economy, and yet they do not believe they should think of themselves as Americans first and foremost, but they should consider themselves as citizens of the world.

They think things like national borders and patriotism are old-fashioned anachronisms totally out of date and out of place in our sophisticated, globalized world economy of today.

I know Strobe Talbott who roomed with former President Clinton in Oxford and who was one of his main advisors. He wrote this: He said within the next 100 years, nationhood as we know it will be obsolete. All States will recognize a single global authority.

He may be right, but I certainly hope not.

I want to read to you what nationally syndicated columnist Georgie Anne Geyer wrote recently about those individuals and multinational corporations that she referred to as globalizers. First, they came and took away Main Street and all that meant in terms of the individual and the community and of small businesses who supported the

Fourth of July parades, the Girl Scouts and the old folks home. Finally, they took away American industries and corporations. They could have headquarters anywhere in the world. They were proud not to belong to any archaic nation-state. Who, after all, really believed anymore? This, always said with such a patronizing smile in such old things. In between, they managed to denigrate patriotism, citizenship, environmental protectionism, labor, including child labor, human rights protection, and all that made for an American society.

As I said earlier, these extreme policies that we have been going to have hurt for many years and are hurting now the small companies, and now even the medium-sized companies and driving them out of business and hurting what I do not like to refer to as the little guy, but that is the most accurate way you can portray it.

I have always heard that what happens in California is soon headed to the rest of the Nation. We better hope not, because people in California wonder why their utility bills have gone up so much. And once again, these environmental extremists have made sure that no power plants were built in many years there.

So while demand was going up, capacity was not keeping up. The brownouts and blackouts of recent weeks were inevitable.

The national news a few weeks ago showed scenes of California farmers dumping out huge amounts of milk because processing plants had to shut down because of lack of power. So people all over the country will see milk prices go higher.

As I said repeatedly tonight, we just need to get some balance and moderation back into some of these policies so we do not drive up the prices and hurt the poor and the lower-income and the working people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. Here are the people who are being hurt by these high energy prices. The gentleman just mentioned the dairy farmers in California having to pour the milk out because they cannot run their operation, keep the milk without the electricity. But farmers are doing their spring planning, an expense that they have to bear for diesel fuel and for gasoline. Those costs are really cutting into, really, a very much shrinking margin that they have to deal with anyway.

In fact, most of our farmers today, with the prices of grain, are fighting a losing battle. Then when you add these fuel prices on top of that, it is just a disaster for them.

The gentleman mentioned the low-income people. They cannot possibly afford these high energy costs, yet back when this started to happen in the winter, when the costs of heating oil and the costs of natural gas to heat their

homes, some people were getting these enormous bills, they could not even afford to make their house payments because of the fuel bills that they were having to come up with.

Of course, we all know about the \$2-per-gallon gasoline. That is projected to get worse through the summer. This just is not fair. It is not right because of a small group that have had their way for the last 30 years. Now they have put us in a situation where our people, the citizens of this country, are not being able to enjoy the fruits of their labor.

The economy has been running in a magnificent way, but it is in danger of putting the brakes on the success that we have seen for the last, goodness, 20 years in this country of prospering and growth in our economy in ways that we may not have ever imagined.

But now we are facing a situation where we could have some problems. We do not have to. We have the resources, and we have the supply, so we need to go after it. Yes, there are going to be some long-term efforts that we are going to have to make, but there are some things that we can do now.

We can start to remove some of the regulations that are causing some problems in getting our energy sources.

Mr. DUNCAN. The gentleman is exactly right, and that is the sad thing. We have plenty of oil, plenty of coal, plenty of natural gas, plenty of timber; as I said, much more timber than we had 50 or even 100 years ago. We have got plentiful supplies.

As the gentleman said, God has blessed this Nation greatly, and yet to stop everything and shut this country down economically just would devastate, first, the poorest people in this country. Yet some of these people who know that it would shut us down and would harm us greatly economically, they feel justified at times because of a misguided belief that we are all destroying the world because of global warming.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to just mention that for a moment. I have a report of Sallie Baliunas, who is a senior staff astrophysicist at the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics and deputy director of the Mount Wilson Observatory. In 1991, Discover Magazine profiled her as one of America's outstanding women scientists.

She received her master's and Ph.D. degrees in astrophysics from Harvard University. She put out a very detailed report. I would be glad to provide copies of it to any Member who wishes, or staff member who needs it, but she says this global warming scare assumes that human emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases are the dominant driving force in recent and probably future climate changes.

Yet surface temperature records indicate that the world is warmed only about 0.5 degrees centigrade during the last 100 years, roughly half of the amount predicted by the computer models on which warming scenarios are

based. Moreover, at least half the warming observed during the 20th century occurred before 1940, while most of the increase in greenhouse gas concentrations occurred after 1940.

That suggests that of the observed warming, mankind is responsible for only about one-tenth or two-tenths of a degree. It further suggests that future temperature increases due to industrial activity during the next century are likely to be extremely modest.

I could come here tonight armed with all kinds of reports that say the exact same thing, and even that the very, very small amount of global warming that has occurred has actually helped us increase crop production and helped alleviate starvation in many parts of the world.

The gentleman started off earlier tonight and said we need to have some sound science behind some of these policies. We have not had that, and we have not had cost-benefit analysis on some of these things, so we have ended up following many policies that have been very costly and very harmful to this country.

Once again, as I say, maybe they have helped a few extremely big businesses, because much of their competition has been driven out of existence; but it should be of great concern to all Americans, particularly those who are concerned and upset about these higher utility bills and higher gas bills and higher prices on everything else, because all of this is hitting at a time when it is becoming more and more difficult for many middle-income people to meet some of these bills.

I have said before that extremely big government really only helps extremely big business and the bureaucrats who work for the government. Extremely big government is really good at only one thing. That is wiping out the middle class.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell my colleagues that every place in the world where the people have allowed their governments to get too big, the middle class has been wiped out, and you end up with a few elitists at the top and a huge underclass.

The great thing about the United States of America is that we have kept our government relatively small in comparison to other countries, and therefore we have had few people at the top and few at the bottom and a huge middle class.

I also can tell my colleagues, you can never satisfy government's appetite for money or land. If we gave every agency and department up here twice what we are giving them, they would be happy for maybe a few weeks or a few months, but then they would come back to us crying about a shortfall in funding.

I also want to mention something about government's appetite for land, because that ties into private property. It certainly ties into these economic problems. But I will yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would love to know the numbers. How many jobs have been lost? How many jobs has this movement cost the workers in this country? How many automobile workers? How many construction workers? How many miners? How many timber workers? How many laborers have lost jobs because of this very extreme position on the environment? It has to be thousands upon thousands, upon thousands of jobs that have been lost.

More are going to be lost if this energy crisis takes our economy in the wrong direction. I think with what we are seeing today with the slowdown, it is a direct result of this energy crisis, of the costs of energy. You cannot have \$2-a-gallon gasoline and the costs of oil and the costs of natural gas without it affecting the economy.

I think that we are seeing a direct result of the energy costs. How many more jobs will it cost? It is the working people that are going to be hurt. It is those folks that get up every day and go out to work and they have to provide for their families. They pull up to the gas station and, gosh, there is \$2-a-gallon gasoline, and it could be getting worse.

□ 2015

I think this is what is happening because of this self-imposed energy crisis. But this can be turned around. Yes, there is no short-term solution. But in the long-term, this can be turned around, and it can provide a lot of employment for a lot of people in this country.

So I think we certainly have to be good stewards. We have to use good science. We have to make sure that we continue on the path of keeping our environment clean and sound. But we have the technology to be able to use our resources and to make sure that the people in this country are able to live their lives to the best that they can live. To have anything at this point to stand in the way of that, I think, would be a tragedy, especially when there was no real need for it to happen.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I could not agree with the gentleman from Kentucky more. He is exactly right. Last year, we had the largest or biggest trade deficit in our history. I think it was \$350 billion. Every leading economist tells us that we lose conservatively 20,000 jobs per billion, which means we lost 7 million jobs to other countries last year; and much of it was because of these extreme policies that we have been following in recent years that have forced more companies to go to other countries and take some of our best jobs.

Once again, as I said earlier, then I have many parents and grandparents coming to me bringing their college-age kids, good-looking kids with good grades, but they cannot find the good jobs that used to be out there. So they

end up, even while they work on master's degrees or something, and then they are still going to have trouble finding these jobs.

I know last year The Washington Times had a big story about the glut of Ph.D.s that we have, and so many people even with the advanced degrees are having trouble finding jobs.

But there is one last thing that I want to get into because it has been a great concern of mine for the last 2 or 3 years. Private property is one of the foundation stones of our prosperity. Once again, some of these extreme environmental groups want the government to take over all of the land.

There is something called the Wildlands Project that I read about in The Washington Post that would require 50 percent of the land now in private ownership to be taken over by the government. If people do not think that theirs will ever be taken over by the government, they should look around at every place in this country and all the land that has been taken over. It has happened all around my area of east Tennessee.

I can tell my colleagues that today the Federal Government owns or controls over 30 percent of the land in this country. State and local governments and quasi-governmental agencies control or own another 20 percent. So half the land is in some type of public ownership.

Then government keeps placing more and more restrictions on what can be done with the land that remains in private hands. In fact, I was told by the Home Builders Association a few years ago that, if the wetlands regulations were strictly enforced, over 60 percent of the developable land that is out there right now would be off limits. So what does that do? That drives up the prices for homes. So we have young families that, in past years would have been able to afford a home, now they cannot afford a very important part of the American dream.

What happens, too, people developed subdivisions in the 1950s and 1960s with big yards. Now developers, the land costs are so high because so little land can be developed that they have to put homes on quarter-acre lots or one-third acre lots. They have to jam more and more people into closer and closer quarters, and so people get this crowded feeling. It really adds to this urban sprawl problem that these environmental extremists are always attacking. Yes, they are the very ones that are causing it.

I can tell my colleagues, private property, while most people do not think about it, it is one of the main things that helped create the prosperity of this country. It is one of the great foundation stones, knowledge of our freedom, but of the prosperity that we have had in this country.

Any one who does not understand this, I wish they would read a book called *The Noblest Triumph, Property and Prosperity Through the Ages* by



Tom Bethell. The whole book is important, but a couple of brief excerpts. He wrote, "Leon Trotsky, a leading Communist, long ago pointed out that where there is no private ownership, individuals can be bent to the will of the state under threat of starvation. The Nobel Prize-winning economist Milton Friedman has said that 'You cannot have a free society without private property' . . . Recent immigrants have been delighted to find that you can buy property in the United States without paying bribes."

"The call for secure property rights in Third World countries today is not an attempt to help the rich. It is not the property of those who have access to Swiss bank accounts that needs to be protected. It is the small and insecure possessions of the poor."

"This key point was well understood (by) Pope Leo XIII (who) wrote that the 'fundamental principle of Socialism, which would make all possessions public property, is to be utterly rejected because it injures the very ones whom it seeks to help.'"

What we have been saying all night here tonight is some of these liberals and left wingers claim to be the friend of the little guy, yet all of these things that they do end up hurting the small businesses and the small farmers and the little guy most of all.

Over the years, when private property has been taken by government, it most often has been taken from lower- and middle-income people and from poor or small farmers. So it is like all these industrial parks that are created. We do not need any more industrial parks in this country. We take land from poor farmers and then turn it over to these big multinational corporations for free or very reduced costs.

Then when we have all of these Federal projects, agencies in my area, for instance, have taken twice the amount of land that they needed to take for their project. It has been a very sad thing to see. But if we allow more and more land to be taken, then we are going to ultimately destroy the freedom that we have in this country and the prosperity that we have in this country. It will be a sad day if we continue to allow that to happen.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS) for any final comments that he wishes to make.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. There has been a lot of polling data over the years; and the question is, would you prefer clean water as opposed to more oil exploration or clean air as opposed to more increased utility power companies? When one asks that question, of course we all want clean air. We all want clean water. We all want safe working conditions.

But the question should have been asked, do you want to be able to have your automobile? Do you want to be able to have reasonable prices for your

energy? Do you want to have the living standards and conditions that you are used to? Do you want running water in your home? Do you want to be able to flip a switch and get the lights to come on? The American people want that.

I think as we are seeing in California today, they are in danger of losing the ability to flip a switch and have their electricity. They are in danger of having hot water because they do not have their hot water tanks generating heat.

So there is going to be some dire consequences to the extreme position that these environmentalists have taken over the last many years and put the American people in a very tough situation if this continues.

That is why we need to start turning it around now. Yes, continue to work very hard to use the technology and to create new technologies to make sure that, yes, when we explore and when we drill for oil, that the environment is protected; yes, that when we use coal, that it is burned cleanly and efficiently so that the environment is protected like it is being done now, natural gas, so forth.

Yes, we want those things. But these extremists, they have a Walden Pond mentality. They want to go out by Walden Pond and give up all, evidently, the conveniences that our forefathers have provided for us, that my father worked hard to provide for his family and on back. They want, for some reason, to think that that is evil to be able to have the standard of living that we have today because it is going to destroy planet Earth.

Well, the reality is that we are not going to destroy planet Earth. We do have the technology. We do have the opportunities to provide the energy resources that the people of this country need and do it in the right way, the environmentally correct way. But get rid of the extremism and make sure that we are not going to sacrifice the workers of this country and their jobs and take away from their families.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, let me just say very quickly in summing up. One example that I wanted to mention was President Bush has been hit real hard on the arsenic in the water, yet one water district in Illinois said, if we went to those unrealistic standards that former President Clinton advocated, their water bills would have to go up \$72 a month.

So what we are saying is we need some balance and moderation brought back into our environmental policies. We cannot keep going along with wealthy environmental extremists who are not hurt when water bills go up \$40 or \$50 a month or gas prices go up to \$3 a gallon or utility bills double. But millions of people throughout this country are hurt if we have to do all of that.

We do not need to shut this country down economically and continue to hurt worse the poor and the lower-income and the working people and the middle-income in this country by forc-

ing more jobs to leave to go to other countries and forcing people to reduce their standard of living by at least a third, as some of these policies would mean, because it is totally unnecessary. Then we would not be able to do the good things for the environment that we all want to do.

So we just need some balance and moderation brought back into these environmental policies.

I thank the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS), my friend, for taking time out from his busy schedule to be with me here tonight to discuss these very important issues.

#### LIVABLE COMMUNITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMMONS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, we have had the first hour discussing issues that relate to energy and the current situation. Some would label it a crisis. I must say that I listened to my esteemed colleagues from the other side of the aisle, but I guess I would take a slightly different tact in terms of the situation we face and the opportunities for improving it.

Having a dependable supply of energy and using it wisely is clearly critical for a livable community. But the current controversy surrounding energy ought to be an example where we can come together and make a difference, where this Congress and this administration can give thoughtful consideration to the impact that energy decisions can have on the livability of our communities and develop a more rational approach to energy utilization.

Now, unfortunately, my friends on the other side of the aisle, the President, his chief spokesperson, and most recently, Vice President CHENEY are setting up a false policy conflict for the American public. This has nothing to do with cutting back on the American quality of life, throwing vast numbers of people out of work.

They would like us to believe that somehow being more thoughtful about the use of energy and the Federal Government's role in promoting a better approach is somehow an assault on the American way of life. Nothing could be further from the truth.

America works best when we give people choices so that they can determine what works best for them. What choice do our friends in California have today paying far more for energy using far less when energy supplies are actually in pretty strong condition? We are going to hear from one of my colleagues tonight from California discussing that situation in greater length.

A country that disregards the value of conservation, that ignores fuel efficiency for automobiles, that seeks to maximize production at the expense of